UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/132,327	08/11/1998	MICHEL SAFARS	USB97-SVN-OM	9217

466 7590 01/07/2005

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
PAULA, CESAR B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/132,327	SAFARS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appears n th cov r sheet with the correspondence address --

Peri d for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 July 2004* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *62-78* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *62-78* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 7/20/2004.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 62-78 are pending in the case. Claims 75-76, and 78 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # PCT/FR98/00917 filed in France on 5/6/1998, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

4. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Appropriate corrections have been made to claims 62-75. Therefore, the rejections of these claims have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 75 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al, hereinafter Robertson (Pat.# 6,486,895, 11/26/02, filed on 9/8/95), in view of Sidana (Pat.# 6,081,829, 6/27/00, filed on 1/31/96), further in view of Lemay et al "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript" hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net (1996, p.65-69).

Regarding independent claim 75, Robertson teaches the organization of web pages into an electronic book using a book metaphor. The web pages are made up of varied *content sources and forms*, such as audio, video, images, etc. (c.1, L.42-67, c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.1-67).

Moreover, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67).

Moreover, Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *the documents are arranged as pages in chapters*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have divided the electronic book into chapters, because Robertson teaches the organization of information in a

book metaphor, and the inclusion of chapters would have enabled a user to organize documents (c.1,L.65-c.2,L.50).

Moreover, Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *pagelets being computer programs that perform different specific functions related to the electronic documents in the electronic books...accessing and altering the structure of the electronic book and being distinct from functions accessing contents referenced by the pages of the electronic book.* Sidana discloses the editing, adding, and deleting of annotations to web pages-- *accessing and altering the structure of the electronic book*-- using functions or buttons—*computer programs*-- located in the web pages (c.7,L.18-67, c.8,L.36-67, and c.9,L.1-67). These functions are different from the functions implemented by the electronic book of Robertson, which manipulate the contents of the web pages in the book. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Robertson, and the functions or buttons (which were programs well known in the art as witnessed by Javascript p.65-69) taught by Sidana, because Sidana teaches above the annotation of web-viewable documents (c.1, L. 33-67). Therefore, the addition of annotations representing a user's comments would provide the benefit of easily annotating web pages, such as the ones in Robertson's electronic book.

Furthermore, Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *electronic book...that are each usable in other electronic books*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have allowed the pages be used in other books, because Robertson teaches the transfer, and use of the electronic book by other users, and that the web pages are converted into interchangeable/rearrangable objects, and the use of the page objects would have enabled a user to interchange, and rearrange the page objects without having to convert these page objects

(c.6,L.1-67). Thereby allowing the creation of webbooks from the website or catalog of web pages having special functionality to alter the structure of the electronic book.

8. Claims 76-78 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al, hereinafter Robertson (Pat.# 6,486,895, 11/26/02, filed on 9/8/95), in view of Sidana, further in view of Javascript, and further in view of Gish (Pat.# 6,233,620, 5/15/01, filed on 7/2/96).

Regarding independent claim 76, Robertson teaches the conversion, and organization—*arrangement*-- of web pages into an electronic book, with a standard interface, using a book metaphor. The web pages are made up of varied *content sources and forms*, such as audio, video, images, etc. (c.1, L.42-67, c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.1-67).

Moreover, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67).

Moreover, Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *pagelets that are computer programs for altering the arrangement of the electronic book, altering the arrangement of the electronic book by executing one of the pagelets*. Sidana discloses the editing, adding, and deleting of annotations to web pages using functions or buttons—*computer programs for altering the arrangement of the electronic book* -- located in the web pages(c.7,L.18-67, c.8,L.36-67, and c.9,L.1-67). These functions are different from the functions implemented by the electronic book

of Robertson, which manipulate the contents of the web pages in the book. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Robertson, and the functions or buttons (which were programs well known in the art as witnessed by Javascript p.65-69) taught by Sidana, because Sidana teaches above the annotation of web-viewable documents (c.1, L. 33-67). Therefore, the addition of annotations representing a user's comments would provide the benefit of easily annotating web pages, such as the ones in Robertson's electronic book.

Moreover, Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *the documents are arranged as pages in chapters*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have divided the electronic book into chapters, because Robertson teaches the organization of information in a book metaphor, and the inclusion of chapters would have enabled a user to organize documents (c.1,L.65-c.2,L.50).

Furthermore, Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *a standardized interface that is independent of computer languages*. Gish teaches the creation of a presentation interface using platform independent JAVA programming language (c.15,L.20-c.16,L.16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Robertson, and Gish, because Gish teaches above benefit of the creation of robust, secure, interfaces, which can be shared across multiple platforms, using JAVA.

Regarding claim 77, which depends on claim 76, Robertson teaches the making of multimedia web pages over the Internet (c.1,L.12-41). These web pages are converted into software objects that have which have a title or description of each page, and then incorporated

into an electronic book or catalog (c.2, L.14-67, fig. 11, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *adding the selected pagelet as a page to a catalog*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have added the selected pagelets to a catalog or website over the Internet, because Robertson teaches the transfer, and use of the electronic book by other users, and that the web pages are converted into interchangeable/rearrangable objects (c.6,L.1-67). Thereby allowing the creation of webbooks, which have their own related subjects, and which allow a user to view more than one page at a time.

Claim 78 is directed towards a method for implementing the method found in claim 76, and, therefore is similarly rejected.

9. Claims 62-74 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Sidana, and further in view of Javascript, further in view of Gish, as applied to claim 76 above, further in view of Weinberg et al, hereinafter Weinberg (Pat.# 5,924,108, 6/13/99, filed on 3/29/96), and further in view of Fein et al, hereinafter Fein (Pat. # 5,924,108, 7/13/99, filed on 3/29/96).

Regarding claim 62, which depends on claim 75, Robertson teaches the indexing and reorganization of web pages, providing navigation information (c.6, L.1-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *searching the internet and adding the search results as new pages, preparing summaries of one or more of the pages, performing statistical analyses, inserting new pages, automatically updating the electronic books*. Weinberg teaches the search, adding, performing

statistical analyses, and automatic updating of web pages to a web site (abstract, col.24, lines 47-67, col. 26, lines 32-67). Fein teaches the summarizing function for creating the summary of a document (col. 4, lines 29-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combine the teachings of Robertson, Weinberg, and Fein, because Weinberg teaches above that these features facilitates document management, and Fein discloses the automatic creation of summaries, which succinctly describe a document's content (col. 2, lines 42-46).

Claims 63-74 are directed towards a method for implementing the method found in claim 62, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicants' arguments filed 10/20/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 75, the Applicants note that there is no suggestion in Sidana to add a page to the electronic book that alters a structure of the electronic book, because only annotations of a few words are added to the annotated pages (p.8,L.1-11). The Examiner disagrees, because Sidana discloses the editing, adding, and deleting of annotations to web pages-- *accessing and altering the structure of the electronic book*-- using functions or buttons—*computer programs*-- located in the web pages (c.7,L.18-67, c.8,L.36-67, and c.9,L.1-67). These functions are different from the functions implemented by the electronic book of Robertson, which manipulate the contents of the web pages in the book. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Robertson, and the functions or buttons (which were

programs well known in the art as witnessed by Javascript p.65-69) taught by Sidana, because Sidana teaches above the annotation of web-viewable documents (c.1, L. 33-67). Therefore, the addition of annotations representing a user's comments would provide the benefit of easily annotating web pages, such as the ones in Robertson's electronic book.

It seems that the Applicants have misunderstood the combination of Sidana, and Robertson. As evidenced above, it is the annotating functions taught by Sidana, which are added to the web document of taught by Robertson, and not just the addition of annotations to the document. The added annotating functions of Sidana introduce a change in the structure (from a simple web document, to a web document including functions, which provide annotating functionality from within the document itself).

Regarding claims 76-78, Applicants indicate that there is no alteration of the structure of the document by adding the pagelets to the document (page 8, lines 12-23). These claims stand rejected at least based on the same rationale set forth above regarding claim 75.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2148**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (every other Friday off) from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306,** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR B PAULA
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178

1/3/05